DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 587 HE 010 695

AUTHOR Slawski, Carl
TITLE Matching of Learning and Teaching Styles: A Typology of Social Distance in Four Cultures.
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association (Portland, Oregon, April 13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Educational Anthropology; Higher Education; Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Learning Characteristics; Learning Experience; *Socialization; Social Relations; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teaching Styles; *Typology

ABSTRACT

A typology of faculty-student relations is presented that focuses on the socialization process taking place within the cultures of college and university departments. By looking at relationships rather than separate roles, an attempt is made to explain the problem of social distance between and among specialists and ways of adaptation and creative accommodation. Within a fourfold matrix, five types of teaching styles are described as potentially meshing with particular learning styles. The five types are: (1) the (democratic) colleague-colleague, and (2) the (hierarchical) prince-disciple (both styles indicating high emphasis of both teacher and student on both task and socio-emotional factors); (3) bureacratic-stranger (low on both task and socio-emotional); (4) merchant-client (high on task, low on socio-emotional); and (5) personalist-needy type (low on task, high on socio-emotional factors in the relationship). Illustrations are taken from ethnographic and journalistic observations made by student evaluators of the classroom. The typology and matching of teacher and learner styles has implications for policy making and may be applicable to learning relationships in all contexts, both in and out of the college setting. A review of the literature on other typologies of teacher and students is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162587

MATCHING OF LEARNING AND TEACHING STYLES:

A TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL DISTANCE IN FOUR CULTURES*

by

Carl Slawski, Ph.D.

of

California State University, Long Beach

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carl Slawski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AE 010 695

*This paper was originally presented at the meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association, in Portland, Oregon, April 13, 1972.

MATCHING OF LEARNING AND TEACHING STYLES:

A TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL DISTANCE IN FOUR CULTURES

by

Carl Slawski

Within a fourfold matrix, five overarching types of teaching style are described as potentially meshing with particular learning styles. This typology of relationship subcultures should supersede previous typologies which generaliy focus on particular aspects of either the teacher or the student role taken separately. The "relevant" underlying variable of social distance is indirectly examined against the background analysis of accommodation styles in a learning relationship in a fourfold matrix of relative stress by teachers and learners on task orientation as well as socio-emotional orientation of goals of education. The five types of appropriately-matched teacher vs. learner style are 1) the (democratic) colleague-colleague, and 2) the (hierarchical) prince-disciple (both styles indicating high emphasis of both teacher and student on both task and socio-emotional factors), 3) bureaucrat-stranger (low on both task and socio-emotional), 4) merchant-client (high on task, low on socio-emotional), and 5) personalist-needy type (low on task, high on socio-emotional factors in the relationship). Then it is suggested that mutual frustrations and problems of social distance between teacher and student, especially in large institutions, might be resolved at least in part by avoiding or preselection to avoid mis-matching of teacher-student types, which frequently result in such unfortunate combinations as the personalist-client (teacher high on socio-emotional, low on task emphasis, student high on task but low on socio-emotional), merchant-needy (teacher high on task, low on socio-emotional, student low on task but high on socio-emotional emphasis), or colleague-stranger (teacher high on task and

socio-emotional factors, student low on both elements, with all of these latter combinations being) types of nonrelationship. Illustrations are taken from ethnographic and journalistic observations made by student evaluators of the classroom scene.

MATCHING OF LEARNING AND TEACHING STYLES:
A TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL DISTANCE IN FOUR CULTURES

by

Carl Slawski

Previous studies of teacher and student types have been primarily descriptive. The present analysis puts a premium on explanation with a view to policy making. It offers a synthetic supertypology focusing on the socialization process taking place within the cultures of college and university departments. Looking at relationships rather than separate roles, it attempts to shed light on the roots of the problem of social distance between and among specialists, with its resulting conflicts, all the while pointing to ways of adaptation and creative accommodation. The typology of faculty-student relations presented here, along with the insights into matching and mismatching of styles, will hopefully be applicable in most aspects to learning relationships in all contexts, both in and out of the college setting.

Background and Literature

Some common problems of learning today include the large size of classes which limits individual attention to each student, as well as the impersonality of the bureaucratic organization in large colleges and universities. Furthermore, the teacher-student relationship as such is definitely a time-limited task-oriented one, hence limited in its depth or emotionality. However, a certain amount of mutual stereotyping is humanly necessary for teachers and students to deal effectively with one another. Yet, stereotyping has the difficulties of tending to freeze the social options of a relationship prematurely. Teacher and student then tend to see one another as a member of a type, with little possibility of changing, with little flexibility, even the kind of flexibility which is

necessary to facilitate learning and develop the individual potentialities of the learner and the teacher. Emotions and even inhibiting anxiety which are natural parts of most of human learning are too often ignored by the current social system of academia. It is to problems such as these that this present essay addresses itself.

First, in order to more easily show the relationship of the literature to the present work, we should review some previous typologies of teachers and students. Most studies have treated the case of teachers and students separately with emphasis on structures of relations between them, but only weak attempts at treating elements of such relations as a socialization process. For example, Joseph Katz (1962) divides students up into four types, those who would aim at passing the course, the minimally involved; those whose need is for control of the knowledge purveyed, likely for a better adjustment to life problems; those whose need is for some personal tie to the teacher, perhaps as an authority figure; and finally, those who are genuinely curious. Joseph Adelson (1962) divides teachers up into three types of model for their students as follows. The shaman is a narcissistic teacher, presumably one who tries to make his students over in his own image. Then there is the priest, whose office is one of healer, a member of a discipline above all, a discipline with continuity, hierarchy, election to office, a mission to perform. And then there is the mystic healer, the altruistic type, probably the most student-centered of the three types, but one which primarily emphasizes personality rather than subject matter. One gets the feeling that such a list is woefully incomplete and biased in the direction of caricature.

Crosscutting the student types of Katz are the subcultures listed by Clark and Trow ( ), the collegiate, vocational, academic and nonconformist. Bolton and Kammeyer (1967) classify them by emphasis on morality and interpersonal

matters, as correlated with the academic and intellectual, to give four types, the privatists, vocationals, conventionals, and academics. Bereiter and Freedman (1962) classify disciplinary members as inner or other-directed and liberal or conservative, as well as on degree of possession of conventiality vs. social confidence.

Then there is Znaniecki's typology of men of knowledge as the technologist, the sage, the scholar and the explorer (1968). Ashley et al (1970) look at the reasons students give for becoming teachers in a means-goals functional typology in which students see teachers as workers, educators, persons and just teachers. Finally, Axelrod (1970) has developed a most insightful fivefold taxonomy of teaching styles based on actual classroom observation. He described the drill-master (or recitation class teacher), the content-centered, the instructor centered, the intellect-centered, and the person-centered faculty member.

All of this is very interesting but still fails to tell us about the effects, or about how such states of being or styles of relationship, as it were, come about in the contextual matrix of interpersonal relations. Underlying the various typologies can be detected, however, a root concern for student problems of social distance from their teachers. It would seem likely then that there might be similar problems between teachers and their fellow faculty members, at least if the usual mechanisms of social process are operating. Could we not then look at the forms of alienation between faculty members of two disciplines for clues to the causes of student alienation?

C.P. Snow (1959) called it "the two cultures" debate. Emory Bogardus called it "occupational distance" (1928). Occupational distance, contends Bogardus, varies directly with the complexity of the culture traits of the respective occupations. The more complex the culture traits of an occupation the greater the vertical (prestigial) distance between itself and the occupations

with less complex structures. And of course occupational centrism leads each group to give itself a superior rating. Following Bogardus, Forrest Wilkinson (1928) suggests that social difference leads to social distance. Following this train of logic, we can see that occupational distance or problems of communication between as well as within certain occupations, professions, or disciplines is likely to be perpetuated in problems of communication between teachers and students unless by some chance of fortune they happen to smoothly mesh despite social differences. And herein lies the social problem.

The present sociological problem then becomes one of developing a more complete and empirically based typology with practical utility for analyzing and then solving problems of harmful social distance. This should be done not by looking only at separated teacher and student roles, but by examining the learning process as a two-way relationship. The means-goals approach, stemming from the small groups literature, gives us a clue to look at task oriented vs. socio-emotionally oriented means and goals of education. We will focus here on the means and goals of education as they pertain to the learning relationship or the process of socialization occurring between faculty and students.

The prime example of thought in this problem area is attributed to C.P. Snow, who felt that intellectual life in the Western world was split into the camps of the scientists and the humanists or literary intellectuals. He also referred to social science, which communicates with and straddles the two cultures. A fourth camp might also be that of the applied scientist or technologist (the engineer). These divisions have in large part been brought about by educational specialization. Snow's position (as interpreted by Lewis, 1967) seems to rest then on four basic propositions, 1) There are at least two cultures; 2) Persons in the different cultures have dissimilar attitudes; 3) Persons in the two cultures hold unfavorable views of each other, and

4) educational specialization is to a degree responsible for emergence of the two cultures.

Lewis found the existence of at least two cultures at least tenable, since there are substantial differences of goal selection between academic groupings. Students and faculty in the humanities felt that the university should carry out many functions, that a basic education is the most important goal, and that vocational training is the least important goal. Those in the social sciences held similar views, but a smaller percentage of them believe that the university should be multifaceted. Those in the sciences took the more limited view that the university should do little more than provide more vocational training. Engineers believe that offering a basic education or providing vocational training is practically the only function of the university. It is classes of differences such as these which are of central concern in the present analysis. The immediate proximate causes of the differences, or the reasons for selection of various types of persons into a discipline are not of prime concern. Of particular interest is Lewis's indication that "scientists adhere to a more confining approach," which would suggest a greater task orientation, with less emphasis on the socio-emotional, and less emphasis on education of the "whole man" than is the case for the humanists. Hence, we can begin to see the broader context of teaching-learning relationship styles.

Further indirect sources of inspiration for the types to be given here include Merton's means-goals functional paradigm, Martindale's (1964) treatment of the objectivity of academic disciplines (humanists vs. scientists), Storer's (1966) analysis of the norms of the social system of science, focusing on norms of <u>orientation</u> or action, skepticism or communality, together with the types of reference group relationships between people discussed by Kuhn (1964) and Denzin (1966), namely, the primary or orientational vs. secondary or

role-specific. Finally, Bloom's taxonomy emphasizes types of cognitive objectives. The newly developed typology is presented in Table I. Since in practice educational means are usually circumscribed by educational goals, and in order to simplify, the typology is based on goals rather than means of education.

ACCOMMODATION STYLES

IN A LEARNING RELATIONSHIP

Socio-Emotionality of Goals	Emphasis on Task Oriented Goals: High	Emphasis on Task Oriented Goals: Med/Low
High	Colleague-Colleague Prince-Disciple	Personalist-Needy
Low	Merchant-Client	Bureaucrat-Stranger

Typology

The four cells, or four cultures, will be discussed as types of accommodation. Accommodation is defined as the typical or patterned style of mutual adaptation, way of solving a problem or attempting to achieve some aim, that becomes characteristic of a relationship between two or more people*

---

* It would be useful to digress here for a moment to introduce a list of twelve means and goals which fall into the same scheme of task vs. socio-emotional items (terms common to the small groups literature, e.g., Bales, 1950). Use of the terms in this educational context was suggested by Brim (1958). Similar types have been developed by Z. Gamson (1966), the utilitarian and normative, and by Vreeland and Bidwell (1966). The following items describe the process going on in the teacher-student relationship but in more specific, operational, and school-organizational terms (Slawski, 1969). The three task oriented means of education are giving critiques, accessibility, and coordination. The socio-emotional means are rapport, subjectivity and democratic interaction. The task oriented goals are creativity, subject mastery, and career advancement. The socio-emotional goals are social values, nonrational sensitivity, and appreciation for ideas. There are also five traits of teaching (Hilde brand, 1970) which are pertinent: Analysis-synthesis, Organization-clarity, group interaction, individual interaction, and dynamism-enthusiasm. The reader is urged while reading on to bear these ideas in mind in order to broaden his thinking.

Briefly anticipating the detailed descriptions of the four types, encompassing five subtypes, a characteristic interaction sequence will reveal the basic educational philosophies of each. The colleague-colleague conversation might run as follows: "Let's decide together what to do on this topic." This indicates high emphasis on both task and socio-emotional orientation in the relationship. A subtype which is also high on both task and socio-emotional factors is the prince-disciple type which would characteristically find the student asking the teacher "What is the best possible thing I can do on this topic?" And the teacher would respond with "Follow this specific program with me." The second general type, the bureaucrat-stranger relationship between teacher and student, might begin with the student asking: "I'm new at

this. How little can I get by with?" The teacher responds: "This is what must be done." The student replies: "Tell us what to do. Show me step-by-step." A third general type is that of the personalist-needy relationship which finds the typical teacher saying: "How are you feeling?" Student replies: "It hurts here!" Teacher responds: "Let me touch it." Student: "That feels good!" A fourth general type is the merchant-client type in which the teacher says: "These are the available goals within this lesson. This one is better than that." Student: "I'll take three of those and two of these." Or, the student might say: "I have problem X. How can I solve it?" Teacher: "Here is how to solve it. What else can I do for you?"

These four patterns of accommodation or learning cultures are not meant to be comprehensive of all subtypes of teacher-student relationship, or philosophies of education. While it should be possible to describe any specific teaching or educational philosophy in terms of various combinations of specific characteristics, the fourfold typology suggested here directs our attention to some of the most important dimensions of any relationship between two or more persons. And we believe it can easily be generalized beyond the teaching relationship to any helping relationship. Future analysis might further profitably delineate the various possible combinations of values in greater detail, within each of the four cells. Although empirically we would not expect such a neat distribution or combination of means and goals, at least the typology will provide a reasonable starting point for more systematically analyzing additional data when it is gathered. But foor now, we must xamine the five types and four cells in more detail.

There are two subtypes within the "orientational" accommodation style, the colleague-colleague or the prince-disciple, the former being democratic, the

latter hierarchical in social behavior pattern. Both are high in both task orientation as well as socio-emotional orientation. By an "orientational" style (taken from Denzin, 1966) we mean a "primar, group" relationship, typical of a family of traditional or institutional pattern, or of close friends, who are able to influence one another's value systems or attitudes to a rather high degree. Between teacher and student it might be a colleagueship in learning, or doing common research of high interest and commitment by both teacher and student, (consistent with Carl Rogers' Freedom to Learn, 1968). Or it might be that paternal type in which the mentor is also the sponsor of the student in his early career and early practical experience in the field. There is continuing personal contact. The learner is either a colleague or disciple whose attitude toward knowledge and learning is that of the "curious" (Katz, 1960), even the innovative type. All forms of teaching (but especially the Socratic method) would typically be used at various times, and the most distinctive specific educative goal of learning would likely be that of creativity. Teaching styles would likely include the person-centered, intellect-centered, and perhaps the instructor-centered styles (Axelrod, 1970).

In order to illustrate further, let us take some examples of ethnographic comments written for a student course evaluation book based on observations of classrooms by several journalistically-minded student evaluators of courses in sociology and anthropology in a large, urban, public university. Anonymity will protect those involved. Naturally the examples do not match the general type in every detail. A prince-disciple relationship (high on both task and socio-emotional elements) might elicit comments such as the following about the classroom atmosphere. This happens to be a course in urban sociology.

Probably the most impressive aspect of this particular course is the man who teaches it. Mr. R-- is an ideal instructor who has learned first-hand the machinations and intricacies of one of the most flagrantly corrupt city governments in the United States... . While I was attending this class, I couldn't overcome the feeling that for once I was listening to someone lecture who actually knew what he was talking about. Of course, I had to first assume that R-- was an intelligent and competent, not to say ambitious, individual. I also assumed that he was one of those who are capable of learning well from his experiences and personal involvements... . As a teacher or professor R-- seemed to me surprisingly dedicated, not only because he regularly shows up to lecture, but because he schedules once a week, two-hour "coffee sessions" to which his students are obviously welcome. Each student is expected to make an appearance at these sessions at least once in the course of the quarter... . All in all, I found R-- surprisingly down to earth, which is to say, not at all pompous or condescending. And again, he can probably teach this course (urban sociology) better than anyone else in the sociology department.

Another example of a prince-disciple relationship, drew the following comments about an anthropology course in primitive religion:

Mr. E-- follows most of the rules and still comes up a good teacher. He uses many techniques to get and keep the class attention--he gesticulates wildly to emphasize a point, he talks to each member of the class--"talks" not lectures. The atmosphere is very spontaneous with a great deal of communication between teacher and student... . The class is small enough that Mr. E-- had begun to learn the names of all students. Some of the class members knew the teacher and each other from previous classes and were more relaxed than is usual in most classes... . Overall, Mr. E-- is an excellent teacher. He uses language beautifully and each lecture...was a well integrated presentation. Don't take the class if you expect to sit back and relax or write letters, etc. Expect to participate, expect to learn.

Next, some comments which fit the colleague-colleague style:

Probably the most impressive aspect of this course, besides the subject matter (race relations), is the instructor, Mrs. S--. First of all, she seems really wrapped up in what she is teaching and her enthusiasm in the classroom has to intellectually stimulate even the dullest student. And what was most unusual was her willingness to carry on a verbal exchange with a "stranger." In this case, I was that stranger, whose only reason for being in the class was to evaluate it. But I, too, ended up taking part in a general classroom discussion, and not once did S-- ask me for identification papers! I could not help being impressed... . As an instructor, Mrs. S-- has no shortcomings, or if she does, I was not aware of them. She is an interesting lecturer, she obviously enjoys the give and take that goes on in constructive classroom discussion, and she does talk to "strangers."

The second general relationship style is the bureaucrat-stranger, a most casual combination. It is defined as role-specific, usually not concerned more than to a moderate or minimal degree with either task achievement or socio-emotionality. A teacher in such a relationship may appear in the lecture hall, and give his lecture with only slight regard for the task of teaching the student (let alone facilitation of learning), and certainly with little emotional involvement with the student. He merely does his duty with a minimum of effort, perhaps being preoccupied with his own research, for which he is, de facto, paid more than for his teaching efforts. In such a system his teaching may become only a hurdle which he must jump in order that the department head or dean will not get after him for absenteeism or incompetence in the classroom. This is probably a more frequent type than most concerned people would like to admit. It is an example of a potentially alienated relationship between teacher and student, especially in the sense of relative isolation from one another. Students in such a situation might go along and be satisfied with the minimum contact with their teacher, except at exam time perhaps. But it also might lead them to organize in unions or federations in order to represent their rights, even going as far as strikes, boycotts of classes, or civil disobedience. It is typified by the mere "acquaintanceship" between people who only see each other briefly or passing on the street, with only rare and shallow interpersonal interest in one another. It might easily be a perversion of the legitimate bureaucratic type, which in reaction to excessive imposition of formalized rules leads to greater and greater disinterest in the goals of the bureaucracy (decried, for example, by Ivan Illich, 1970). It might also be described as a distant, indifferent, or detached type of accommodation to one another. The learner in the bureaucrat-stranger relationship becomes like the subject in an experiment, with no more than a "passing" attitude toward knowledge

and course material (Katz, 1962). The teaching style is liable to be instructor-centered content-centered or the drill master type (Axelrod, 1970).

Note that when we describe a relationship as characterized by low task orientation here, it means relatively low or medium, as opposed to high, taking into consideration that any relationship designated educational will have at least some explicit task to accomplish. But we are here more concerned with relative emphasis, and degree of externality of the task to the individual's personal or socio-emotional well-being.

Ethnographic descriptions which fit the bureaucrat-stranger type include the following. First a class in methods of social research:

> H-- talks. He talks with language--technical language. The technical language of professional sociologists. If you concentrate very hard--you tune into one of his fifteen minute raps--you play along with his professional game, and what do you learn? You learn that sometimes, in a sociological study, your use of volunteers or nonvolunteers may or may not affect the accuracy of the sociological study, depending upon whether the outcome of the sociological study was or was not affected by the use of volunteers or nonvolunteers. If you find this a revelatory experience, you'll probably have the desire to concentrate again on what he says. If not, your thoughts will probably wander to the girl sitting next to you or to what life will be like when you get away from classes like this.
> H-- takes himself very seriously as a sociologist--more as a sociologist than as a teacher. I had the impression that he was more concerned with going through the material in his head, than in communicating it to the students. A high number of students seemed to not be following what was going on in the room; the blame probably lies as much with them for not asking questions as for H--'s slippery presentation.

An anthropology class in folklore elicited the following comments:

> Mr. R-- is a snob folklorist--he has become one of the elite few and condescendingly "gives" his class the outlined knowledge he has. If someone ripped off his notes, I don't know what would happen. He gets upset if you ask a question out of sequence, and says, "I'm coming to that next" so you get an explanation, but you feel really awful for disturbing him. He is very straight...and is now trying to become hip. This quarter he's growing a beard, and wearing colored shirts. Perhaps when he gets his Ph.D. in a year, everything will change, he really wants that Ph.D. and isn't doing anything to "hurt" his chances.

A second observer saw the same folklorist this way:

> Mr. R--is an anthropologist, specializing in American Folklore. He is a man dedicated to his field, with enormous amounts of knowledge in his head. He comes off as dry as the previous sentence and his own style may leave the impression that what he speaks about is unrelated to what is going on in your own mind. He is a one-dimensional man.

The third general type is the merchant-client relationship. It is an economic style, based on the goal of scholarly mastery. This accommodation style is high in task orientation but low in socio-emotionality, such as is typical of a super-market grocery clerk, or a bank teller, where the customer comes in for a specific purpose, is promptly served, and completes his business with a minimum of delay and conversation. It would be typical of a department in a university where status is at a premium. The faculty sees its job as training the students to be technically competent, yet independent, even isolated scholars or researchers. Mobility is gained in the "contest" style, as opposed to "sponsorship" (Turner, 1960). The student is present to be trained, to complete his course requirements, to get out, and to get a job. In his job, he probably continues this type of relationship, as is common among say engineers, who are secure in their training, competent, and confident that they can get a job anywhere they go, except of course in difficult times. Thus they are not required to become attached to their employer or employing institution. When they receive a better monetary reward, or are offered a higher salary somewhere else, they do not hesitate to take the new job, because they have likely formed few emotional attachments to their occupational situation.

This type of relationship might be quite frequent in the multiversity, since there are too many students for teachers to interact with, except those working for them as assistants, so that it would be unusual for a teacher even to remember the names of more than a few members of his class a year afterward. This lack of contact outside the classroom does not allow much emotional

attachment. And in fact such attachment would probably be perceived as disruptive of the task oriented classroom decorum, which is impersonal, or at least nonpersonal, with mastery of techniques, facts, and data analysis as rather completely dominating the interaction between teacher and student.

The learner in this economic style of relationship becomes that client whose attitude to knowledge is likely to be programmed toward "control" of knowledge, or learning for the sake of controlling, or mastery of the environment (Katz, 1962). The teaching style would likely be that of the content-centered, the drillmaster or intellect-centered types (Axelrod, 1970). The following sampling of student evaluations of this type of relationship fit the description. From a course in urban sociology:

> Mrs. W-- reminded me of the sweet little old grey lady who works in a dress shop: both in her physical appearance and in her overall presentation. All her words are coated with a stupid little smile--as though you wouldn't consider them credible if they weren't. And likewise, her classroom hangs under the polished atmosphere of a dress shop.
> Actually the class reminded me of the old Mickey Mouse Club: the material they were covering seemed remarkably remedial and the whole performance of the class resembled Mrs. Minnie Mouse in front of her Merry Mouseketeers. There is a lot of dialogue--give and take--between Minnie and her troupe, but it resembles the Mouseketeers' sing-a-long, rather than real discussion of anything.
> W-- moves around quite a bit in front of the classroom--mostly back to her desk to check her note cards, as she forgets which song her mice are working on. The class is void of excitement or enthusiasm--it just lumbers along: through the hour, through the day, through the term, through life.

Another observation of the merchant-client type of relationship brought the following remarks about a course in introduction to anthropology. The instructor gave up a successful business to become a teacher.

> Generally lecturing without notes--M-- knows his subject so well that not only is he able to express his thoughts logically and clearly, he also is capable of making a point to the class by relating some of his own personal experiences and through the use of anecdotes that are not only humorous but very often full of wisdom. Dr. M-- has that rare ability to make his listeners listen! Once he captures your attention, it remains captured.

The same instructor, evaluated in a course in peasant culture drew the following comments:

> The instructor encourages his students to participate in the class and often initiates the discussion or stops for questions. He seems generally interested in provoking a feel for the subject, rather than a specific knowledge of anthropology.
> As a result, the lecture is somewhat disorganized. Often, the material is interesting but has no real correlation to the texts or the course. Students took few notes in his class and little concrete information was given. Often the instructor went off on tangents, relating one experience after another and giving no real base for the lecture. The class does promote an interest in the subject and the sessions are enjoyable. However, most factual learning in this course must be done outside of class.

The fourth general type of relationship is the personalist-needy style, which is altruistic, subjective, high in socio-emotionality but low in task orientation. It is typified by the religious monk, pastor, or self-sacrificing friend, spouse or parent. It has special reference to the teacher who is imbued with the idea of inspiring or instilling his students with knowledge. It might be most typical of the dedicated and competent high school teacher who enjoys working with young people for its intrinsic emotional payoff. He would have medium or low task orientation, because he may have found that overemphasis on grades, assignments, memorization, etc., only hinders the rapport he deems necessary to be a truly imitable model for the student. He might be an advocate of progressive education, which is problem centered and student centered, but yet has no specific problems to be completed in any set period of time. The process of education is important to him, to the point where he is willing to stay after school to talk to students with special problems or special interests, in order to motivate them to pursue their interests further. His own academic specialty is allowed to intervene or become central only so long as it is of help to the student to become concerned with it. On these grounds, he would more likely be a generalist than a specialist. Or if he is a specialist, he is broadminded enough, and self-denying enough to put the students' interest first.

We would also expect that a student in such a relationship would want to be friends with his teacher, perhaps helping him with chores, errands, or in return, volunteering help with some of the teacher's special projects. The learner in the altruistic relationship becomes the needy one whose attitude toward knowledge is likely to be "personal" (Kate, 1962). With a strong personal regard toward the instructor. Teaching style for the personalist will naturally be person-centered (Axelrod, 1970). A classroom in the sociology of social problems exemplifies the type.

> The teacher states: "I learn at least as much from students as they do from me... ." He became a teacher "to learn more."
>
> P-- impressed me as being about the best graduate student I've run into. His lecture was organized, yet flexible enough so that the atmosphere in the classroom was not stifling. He was an articulate speaker--in being able to verbalize what he wanted to say and in conducting or controlling what the students had to say. Students' participation was frequent and spontaneous--students seemed to be saying exactly what was on their minds: discussion and arguments in the class frequently became heated. There was a feeling of openness or freedom in the room: an aliveness--an enthusiasm and excitement. The excitement was about social problems: becoming familiar too with what they are, applying the methods of the sociologist to these problems, and actually dealing with the problems, in a field-study method.

Matching or Mismatching

Using the above fourfold typology as a basis, we will now summarize the outlines of our cross-typology insofar as it directly deals with the matching of teaching and learning styles. Following this will be a treatment of some possible results, good or ill. It will be instructive for the reader to recall actual teachers and students he has personally known in order to gain a more graphic experience with the use of the typology.

We have seen that there are five basic types of teachers according to our taxonomy, the teacher as prince or colleague, personalist, merchant and bureaucrat. Cross-tabulating these with the five kinds of students or learner types (student as needy, client, stranger, colleague or disciple) we can come

up with twenty-five combinations in the teacher-student relationship. Each of the types is based on a combination of emphasis on task and/or socio-emotional factors in the performance of their respective duties. As we have seen, the teacher as prince and the teacher as colleague both put high emphasis on task as well as socio-emotional factors. The teacher as prince however does so in a hierarchical manner, while the teacher as colleague treats the student as a democratic equal as far as the role allows. The teacher as personalist de-emphasizes the task, but emphasizes the socio-emotional aspects of the relation-ship. The teacher as merchant does the reverse, emphasizing the task factors, not the socio-emotional. And the teacher as bureaucrat puts minimum emphasis on neither task nor socio-emotional factors, only doing the minimum necessary to satisfy the job requirements.

The student types follow the same five combinations of emphasis on means and goals but are labeled differently. Agreement or meshing of emphasis is naturally the most likely to work out smoothly. As implied above, the student as disciple best corresponds to the teacher as prince, with a hierarchical manner of decision-making, but equal high emphasis on both task and socio-emotional factors. The student as colleague then naturally corresponds to the teacher as colleague, with democratic mode, and still high emphasis on both task and socio-emotional items. The student who comes as the needy one matches best with the teacher as personalist who emphasis the socio-emotional while minimizing the task factors. The student as client best fits the teacher as merchant, both emphasizing task factors and minimizing the socio-emotional. Finally the student as stranger best fits the teacher as bureaucrat who places the minimum emphasis on both task and socio-emotional factors.

From the administrators point of view it is likely that teachers and students in a given school or department will either be or become similar

or meshing types, at least after a period of initial mutual adjustment to one another, short of outright clashing and taking of sides, as has been the case in recent movements of reform, revolution and protest. In large, public, urban universities, we would expect that the appropriately but unfortunately matched teachers as bureaucrats and students as strangers to predominate (both putting the minimum necessary emphasis on task and socio-emotional factors), each merely doing only what is necessary to satisfy the exigencies of their role. Time, energy, diversity of interests, and the unfortunate tendency toward measurable productivity, namely the commuter-factory-marketplace-vocational style of education makes other possibilities unlikely. Another likely and matching combination in today's large urban colleges is the teacher as merchant combined with the student as client (both emphasizing task factors and playing down the socio-emotional).

In the smaller, and perhaps less prestigious women's colleges we might well expect teachers to act in the personalist mode, with students as needy (both being low on task but high on the socio-emotional). In the leading smaller liberal arts colleges and the best universities, giants excepted, we would likely or at least hopefully, find a greater proportion of well-matched combinations of prince-disciple and colleague-colleague relationships. We might also find the comic-tragic mismatch of prince (or princess) and stranger (where the teacher is hierarchical, high on task and socio-emotional, but the student contributing little in either the task or socio-emotional realms). The result might be as follows.

> Actually, most students didn't seem to know what to do with her: the confrontation with an instructor who was not boring, tired, and with one foot in the grave surprised them. Perhaps the best expression that applies to S--'s class is "childish enthusiasm":

The possibility of mismatch between teacher and student styles is great for any given teacher or student style. The teacher as personalist for example

(low on task but high on socio-emotional factors) will directly clash with the student as client (or customer, being high on task but low on socio-emotional factors).

> Sometimes he simply acts like a shmuck and you would feel like punching him in his premature paunch and making him vomit all over his sweater, but the funny thing about him is that he would take you on, right there in class. He might whip you down or kiss you down, depending on the social variables. Without tongue-in-cheek, S-- is a realist, in class as well as outside of class. And he wants all of the students to respond as people and not "nigger students": "Yessah, boss. None of that shit in S--'s class. Believe me, he won't stop until he gets nearly everyone involved in the class, and his class is dealing with reality. To witness what S-- does, and puts up with, is remarkable. He asked the class to describe, orally, their ideal city, all dimensions to be considered, and then asked for volunteers. The three or four regulars, out of 40, raised their hands, ventured forth, and then got bitten. S-- continually disagreed on every count, regardless of the answer. After the 6th or 7th person, someone stood up and actually yelled at S--, saying that "you (S--) said we could have anything in our ideal city, but when we say anything, you attack it. Why?" At last, a human has appeared on the scene. S-- proceeded to explain and apologize to the class. First, he explained that just because he stands at the front, doesn't necessarily mean he is more correct, and for that reason and that reason alone, did the students so easily back down on their ideas. He apologized for harassing "correct" answers, but then showed how the ideal city is inconceivable, when you are dealing with the million or so variable people. Once that had been realized, there would be a basis to work from. To work and improve is man's lot. Not once did a student actually think about the problem of planning for humans. No one thought about sex, education, economics, and most real, race. Not one single student mentioned race, when that is the single most important question at hand. S-- made them realize this, and maybe even think about the real world, and if he did, then he is a better teacher than most.

The teacher as merchant (high on task but low on socio-emotional) will directly clash with the student as needy (low on task and high on socio-emotional.) And teachers as colleagues (high on both) will clash with students as strangers (low on both), the teacher being democratic.

> What was most unusual was her willingness to carry on a verbal exchange with a "stranger." In this case, I was that stranger, whose only reason for being in the class was to evaluate it. But I, too, ended up taking part in a general classroom discussion, and not once did S-- ask me for identification papers! I could not help being impressed.

Perhaps the most wretched combination of all is the bureaucrat-needy mismatch (teacher low on both, but student low on task, yet high on socio-emotional).

> Room 234, Space Hall, is very large, and from the last row, Mr. M-- looks far away. But I have a sneaking suspicion that even if you're in the first row, he'd appear far away.
>
> M-- knows what he's talking about, and you could learn some vital things from him. Could, I say, because it will be hard to reach him. Try a note. If you get no response, try another note, stating the reason that you want to talk to him. Still no response? Call and leave a message, expecting no response. Then you may be able to catch him as he leaves the lecture.
>
> If sacrificing "interaction" is acceptable to you, then perhaps you can accept M--.
>
> If grades are your hang up, then know that you'll have to study, because in M--'s words: "This isn't a welfare program and I don't give grades on the basis of need."

Another evaluator on the same course stated that:

> M--'s class is like a nightmare...no, it's not like a nightmare, it is a nightmare. I have never experienced a poorer public speaker--which is really bad, as the class is all lecture. M-- has poor projection, low volume (students occasionally shouted "What?"), and sloppy articulation. He hides behind the podium and keeps his eyes fixed about three inches above his notes. His words never really get out of his mouth, as though he had two sets of teeth, which keep his words from leaving his mouth. M-- doesn't lecture or even talk, he just mumbles and grumbles like a senile old man: he tries talking without opening his mouth. There was no enthusiasm and no professionalism to his presentation. M-- is like the worst actor: saying nothing and doing a poor job of it.
>
> M-- did one remarkable thing: he gave a prepared lecture, and it still wasn't organized. Most sociologists, when illustrating a point, will use case studies or personal experiences. M-- appeared to be just making up his stories. The class scene might be summed up in the fact that M-- takes roll every day. The students appeared to be a little embarrassed at being in the class: The class is such a joke one wants to cry. Much of M--'s material has to do with love and marriage: the really tragic thing is that he comes on like a dirty old man. I have nothing good to say about M--. At first, I couldn't believe any instructor could be so bad. I asked people in the class and other sociology majors: they all agreed--M-- is really bad, probably the worst.

Another example of a bureaucrat-needy mismatch is this one on the sociology of the arts.

Walking into Dr. B--'s class unaware that it is the Sociology of the Arts that he is teaching is like walking into the middle of a dream, either his or yours. He has this knack for lecturing in stream-of-consciousness. Half of what he says makes sense and sometimes you even get the general idea.

There were many things going on in Dr. B's class that had little to do with Sociology. The most obvious was a clash between the middle-aged Dr. B-- and his much younger students. He obviously resents the younger generation and makes no bones about saying exactly what it is about young people that bothers him. This is fine and would make an interesting discussion, if only Dr. B-- would stop raving and let the other side talk.

He is obviously intelligent and experienced but there are many personal factors that keep him from being a good instructor. His students offered two pieces of advice that he would do well to follow when, at the end of one class, they almost begged him to "say something" and "listen."

Unfortunately, in the giant institutions, we find many mismatches with students coming as <u>disciples</u> or <u>colleagues</u> who meet with teachers as <u>merchants</u> or <u>bureaucrats</u>, and as often as not see their teachers as exploiters, insensitive, and reactionary.*

---

*Some fascinating parallels could be drawn here to the approach of transactional analysis (e.g., T. Harris, I'm OK—You're OK, 1970). Even the well-matched relationship such as that of the prince-disciple could be seen as an adult-adult relationship; personalist-needy as parent-child type; bureaucrat-stranger as adult-adult; merchant-client as parent-adult. And only the colleague-colleague relationship could readily be seen as a fully adult-adult style of learning relationship.

The <u>merchant-colleague</u> mismatch (both high on task, teacher low on socio-emotional, but student high on socio-emotional input), might come out looking like this social psychology course.

He is more bent on expounding his opinion than on presenting any viable framework of knowledge. There's nothing wrong with any instructor having his own views, as long as they're labeled as such. It certainly is wrong when evidence is weighted to support only one set of views in any one class. He invited people to speak up, but nobody is willing to argue with him anymore. We already knew what he's going to say. So, what's the use? The resulting discussions develop into a battle of opinions rather than an exploration of the field.

> There's no trouble psyching him out if you want an easy grade, but by this time such childish considerations should be unimportant. I found my experiences with H-- completely unrewarding.

The same instructor in a course in criminology drew comments like this:

> Despite his familiarity with criminology, H-- is utterly incapable of making his class interesting. People in the room seemed bored, tired, dead petrified--there was absolutely no enthusiasm, no excitement; everyone was just sitting around getting old with H--. Therefore, it was not a surprise, that when the fire bell rang, the class just went on--no one cared; if Space Hall was burning down: after all, burning to death would at least be a release from the monotony of classes like H--'s.

Another example of a merchant-colleague mismatch occurred in an anthropology course in language and culture:

> Mrs. H-- is a young woman with a soft voice, modulated by large gasped breaths between every few words, chain smoking--large drag variety-- and very pronounced in her syllables.
>
> Although she tries hard, she's either talking to an audience of retarded idiots or else she thinks she's speaking to one made up of kindergarten children--someone should tell her she's teaching twenty-year olds, not two-year olds. For instance, the obvious question, "What is anthropology?" was followed by, "Make sure you spell it with 'h'"--you'd think college students could spell the courses they are taking.
>
> By 5:30 anyone is tired at the end of a long day, and it's hard to be alert and aware--in a class so condescending it's hard to even listen.

The list of mismatches could go on almost endlessly. But then, of course, there are exceptional teachers and students performing more or less as fish out of water in such environments. Oft-decried is the needy student seeking a personalist guru, a student who becomes lost in the multiversity. He is unwittingly treated merely as a stranger or a client, with unfortunate personal results for the student. He feels hopelessly lost or angry. And on the other side of the coin, there is, for example, the teacher trying to be a colleague in a megaversity where the students come mainly as clients or strangers. The result for a conscientious teacher, who refuses to see his relationship with students as one of cog upon cog in the knowledge factory, will likely be frustration for him and

popularity with a small percentage of students, those few who come receptive to the collegial role, which is demanding of both social and academic energies. All but the rarest of attempts on the part of a teacher caught in this kind of circumstance to change the system is doomed to failure. He is not only outnumbered but fighting what seems to this writer to be an ingrained nonrational tradition of impersonal, satisficing, bureaucratic, secondary relationships. His only recourse, if he values his job, is to modify his ideals, to modify his desire for a community of scholars, in order to conform to the frustrating tendency to make of school a knowledge machine.

Is there hope then for the humane teacher or eager student? Is there room for him in the system, or even in the best smaller colleages? With the financial squeeze in education today there is more than room for serious doubt. And the quality of education obtained by our young people is at stake. Perhaps a policy-oriented study of the implications of the ideas presented in this essay would be a first step toward understanding and then resolving this dilemma of social distance.

Speaking for the present, some initial practical conclusions might involve the following recommendations. Teachers and students can learn to switch modes, every week, or even every class day. We can use a variety of approaches to the learning task. And we can do this in ways which best promise to lead to the type of knowledge desired. For example, the three basic types of knowledge, namely, 1) facts, 2) skills, and 3) reasoning, might best be learned respectively by 1) lecture or reading), 2) laboratory practice, and 3) guided discussion techniques. If we then use the appropriate means to each goal, greater knowledge will be imparted. We must adapt to the subject matter, the cultural and organizational setting, as well as to our own personalities as teachers and students. Our flexibility and social intelligence as teachers and students

are the keys. Surely nothing great will be achieved unless all concerned are prepared to take risks to produce creative results.

REFERENCES

Adelson, Joseph
1962 "The Teacher as a Model." Ch.10, pp. 396-417 in N. Sanford, ed., The American College. New York: Wiley.

Ashley, B., H. Cohen, D. McIntyre, and R. Slatter
1970 "A Sociological Analysis of Students' Reasons for Becoming Teachers." The Sociological Review 18, 1, (March): 53-69.

Axelrod, Joseph
1970 "The Teaching Styles in the Humanities." pp. 38-55 in William H. Morris, ec., Effective College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Bales, Robert F.
1949 "A Set of Categories for the Analysis of Small Group Interaction." Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society. New York: (December 28-30).

Bereiter, Carl, and Mervin Freedman
1962 "Fields of Study and the People in Them." Ch. 17, pp. 563-596 in N. Sanford, ed., The American College. New York: Wiley.

Bloom, Benjamin, ed.
1956 Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: David McKay.

Bogardus, Emory S.
1928 "Occupational Distance." Sociology and Social Research 13: 73-81

Bolton, Charles D., and Kenneth C. Kammeyer
1967 The University Student: A Study of Student Behavior and Values. New Haven: College and University Press.

Brauner, Charles J.
1964 American Educational Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Brim, Orville G., Jr.
1958 Sociology and the Field of Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brubacher, John S.
1965 Bases for Policy in Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill.

Brubacher, John S.
1962 Modern Philosophies of Education, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Clark, Burton R., and M. Trow

Denzin, Norman
1966 "The Significant Others of a College Population." Sociological Quarterly 7 (Summer): 298-310.

Gamson, Zelda F.
1966 "Utilitarian and Normative Orientations Toward Education." Sociology of Education 29 (Winter): 46-73.

Harris, Thomas A., M.D.
1969 I'm OK--You're OK, A Practical Guide to Transactional Analysis. New York: Harper and Row.

Hildebrand, Milton, and Robert C. Wilson
1970 "Effective University Teaching and its Evaluation." Unpublished manuscript. Davis: University of California.

Illich, Ivan D.
1971 Celebration of Awareness. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday (Anchor).

Katz, Joseph
1962 "Personality and Interpersonal Relations in the College Classroom." Ch. 9, pp. 365-395 in N. Sanford, Ed., The American College. New York: Wiley.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom, and B. B. Masia
1956 Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay.

Kuhn, Manford.
1964 "The Reference Group Reconsidered." Sociological Quarterly 5 (Winter): 5-22.

Lewis, Lionel S.
1967 "Two Cultures: Some Empirical Findings." Educational Record 48 (Summer): 160-167.

Martindale, Don
1964 "The Roles of Humanism and Scientism in the Evaluation of Sociology." Ch. 18, pp. 452-490 in G. Zollschan and W. Hirsch, eds., Explorations in Social Change. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

McKeachie, Wilbert J., R. L. Isaacson, and John E. Milholland
1964 Research on the Characteristics of Effective College Teaching. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan.

Mursell, J.
1954 Successful Teaching: Its Psychological Principles, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw Hill.

Rogers, Carl R.
1969 Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Sanford, Nevitt
1962 The American College. New York: Wiley.

Simpson, Ray H.
1966 Teacher Self Evaluation. New York: Macmillan.

Slawski, Carl
1969 The Career Ideology of Specialists. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Snow, C.P.
1959 The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Storer, Norman W.
1966 The Social System of Science. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Turner, Ralph
1960 "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System." American Sociological Review: 855-867.

Vreeland, Rebecca S., and Charles E. Bidwell
1965 "Classifying University Departments: An Approach to the Analysis of Their Effects Upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes." Sociology of Education 39, #3 (Summer): 237-254.

Walker, Edward L., and W. J. McKeachie
1967 Some Thoughts About Teaching the Beginning Course in Psychology. Belmont: Brooks-Cole.

Wilkinson, Forrest, Mrs.
1928 "Social Distance Between Occupations." Sociology and Social Research 13: 234-244.

Znaniecki, Florian
1936 Social Actions. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

Znaniecki, Florian
1968 The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Harper and Row.